DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 475 008 EA 032 453

AUTHOR	Aitken, Art; Bedard, George; Darroch, Amber
TITLE	Designing a Master Program in Educational Leadership: Trends, Reflections, and Conclusions.
PUB DATE	2003-02-17
NOTE	52p.; Paper presented to the Faculty of Education, University of Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Education; *Educational Administration; *Educational Change; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Leadership Training; Management Development; *Masters Programs; Principals; Relevance (Education)
IDENTIFIERS	*Alberta

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a dialogue about the current context for educational leadership preparation that draws upon worldwide thought and discussion on the issue. Topics considered include recognition by faculty at the University of Lethbridge that educational leadership has problems in content alignment, relevance, and pedagogy. Research shows that many educational leadership programs at the university level have questionable recruitment and selection practices, a weak knowledge base, a lack of connection to practice, and a lack of attention to education and ethics, among other problems. To address these issues, the University of Lethbridge proposes an educational leadership program that focuses on school leadership from three key perspectives: principals as educators, moral stewards, and community builders. The most profound challenge the faculty faces is moving away from the disciplinary, role-oriented, and administrative "silo" structure, in which subjects are taught in relative isolation from each other, to a more holistic, focused, and integrated preparation of school leaders. Appendices describe provincial leadership initiatives and proposed course content, list Internet resources for educational leadership development programs, present a chart for assessing the faculty's master's program, and provide summary notes on proposed master's programs at various universities. (Contains 73 references.) (RT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

EA EATR
0143

ED 475 008

Designing a Master Program in Educational Leadership: Trends, Reflections, and Conclusions

by

Dr. Art Aitken
Dr. George Bedard
Amber Darroch

Presented to the Faculty of Education
The University of Lethbridge

February 17, 2003

EA032453

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. AITKEN

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Acknowledgements

Special thanks go to Dr. Jane O'Dea, Dean, Faculty of Education, and Dr. Kris Magnusson, Associate Dean, for their support and encouragement during the passage of approval for the new master's specialization program. Dr. Rick Mrazek, Assistant Dean, Graduate Programs, also played a major role in keeping us apprised of protocols, procedures, and parameters for developing new courses and a new program. Thanks to our colleagues in the Faculty of Education who were willing to critique our work and to embrace change as an essential component of continuous program improvement. Thank you to Dr. Nola Aitken for her tireless and patient editing, for her timely suggestions regarding formatting, and for her support and insights. There were many conversations that provided us with inspiration and ideas.

Art Aitken
George Bedard
Amber Darroch

THE CONTEXT **4**

Introduction 4
Search for Standards 7
Alberta-Based Program Revisions 12
The Knowledge Base 13
The Dialectic Age 14
Restructuring and Educational Leadership 17
Educational Leadership Models 19
Professionalizing the Teacher and Educational Leadership 21
The Governance Model—and Educational Leadership 22
Values, Morals, and Ethics in Educational Leadership 23

PROGRAMMING FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP **24**

Collaborative learning initiatives 24
Assessing the current program 26
Measuring up to the Standard (Characteristics) 27
Changing to meet a standard 28
Applying the Standard: Purpose and Structure of the Master's Specialization in Educational Leadership 30
Summary and Conclusion 34

REFERENCES **35**

APPENDIX A **40**

Provincial Leadership Initiatives 40

APPENDIX B **42**

Proposed Course Content 42
Culminating Options 44

APPENDIX C **45**

Internet Resources for Educational Leadership Development Programs 45
A. Leadership Profiles and Checklists *45*
B. Principals' and Teachers' Organizations and their Leadership Resources *45*
C. University Educational Leadership Initiatives *46*
D. Provincial/State Level Leadership Resources and Research *47*

APPENDIX D **49**

Assessing the Faculty's Master's Program 49

APPENDIX E **50**

Summary Notes – Graduate Level Educational Leadership Programs 50

The Context

Introduction

In this paper we present a dialogue about the current context for educational leadership preparation that draws upon on worldwide thought and discussion on the issue. We briefly examine some of the significant developments and a new conceptualization of educational leadership, and we link these developments to implications for preparation of school leaders for the future. We conclude with a structure and content proposal for a Master of Education cohort focus group specializing in educational leadership at The University of Lethbridge.

Until 2002 a prospective principal or leadership-oriented teacher could register in the University of Lethbridge General Education Master's degree program and declare a focus on educational administration. The student would complete four required courses of core—addressing curriculum studies, foundations of theory and practice, professional development, and research methods. This core could be supplemented by a series of up to seven graduate and general elective courses, coupled with exit requirements in the form of a project, thesis, or comprehensive exam—completing a course equivalency of 12 courses for the program. The core was initially defined in an external review (Barman, Maguire, & Thomas, 1992) and was developed to provide a base of educational theory for all education master's students regardless of their chosen focus. This program review that informed the structure and the subsequent program development occurred prior to new understandings that have dramatically affected education and leadership throughout the 1990s and into the early years of the 21st century. These understandings are outlined throughout this paper. The general and elective courses at the graduate level listed in the handbook total 20, of which seven are geared to the needs of counseling students in particular. Of the 13 remaining courses, four are essentially

repeats (or extensions) of topics covered in the core; three involve primarily independent or field study, two are designed to cater to special interests and diversity (global culture and gender), and one only addresses educational leadership and administration in particular. At a faculty meeting (April, 2002) the Education Faculty administrators acknowledged the need to supplement the General Education Master's program to reflect an educational leadership focus. Some of the rationale included the need to respond to the contextual changes that have occurred recently, and to ensure that academic standards are aligned with the university's overall purpose. Preference was also expressed to design the leadership focus around a cohort model to maximize learning opportunities for students and to allow for certain organizational concerns about scheduling and ensuring course availability.

An examination of this program structure can be framed around questions of content alignment, relevance, and pedagogy. For example, is there a degree of consistency between education faculty leadership preparation and the demands and challenges of the Alberta principalship? Are the original purposes that guided the conceptual map for the University of Lethbridge education master's program still relevant for the preparation of school leaders? Does the contemporary context (including social, economic, and political factors; and the changes in institutional, management, and technical aspects of teaching and learning), demand that faculty consider the relevance of our current leadership program offering? Does the program content and the pedagogy of curriculum delivery match the evolution of educational leadership programs in the past 15 years?

In creating a leadership focus, the faculty has an opportunity to develop a new and responsive framework for preparing educational leaders based on current understandings about leadership preparation, the realities of the work place, and demands of the programs and operations of Alberta schools. A program restructuring also affords the opportunity to address the principalship around a conceptual model of leadership. Pivotal to this process of renewal is

the need to specify and codify the course content under the direction of university professors who are invited to play a significant role in identifying a relevant knowledge base.

In considering the design of the leadership program, the Alberta context is important. Various information sources told us that the need for school leaders in Alberta is great as a large cohort of incumbents retire from the profession. Several sources noted the reluctance of teachers to fill incumbents' shoes in the wake of 1990s era changes in Alberta. Many of these changes have prompted potential leadership candidates to think twice before taking on what is widely perceived as a thankless and more difficult role. Recent changes include: site-based decision-making (SBDM), provincial assessment schemes, the professionalization of the teacher, additional mandates and workloads, reporting for accountability, stagnating compensation packages, and increasing acrimony between the Klein government and the ATA.

Alberta, like most Canadian provinces, has no licensure requirements for school administrators and although a Master degree in education is a preferred requisite for job seekers, few have received university level preparation in leadership beyond a course here and there. Some have been exposed to in-house leadership development programs facilitated by school districts and the ATA. Informants (master's students and leadership practitioners we consulted) complained that faculties of education are not sensitive enough to the needs of the field and have ignored calls for revamping programs, particularly in a way that addresses the relationship of theory and practice in the design of leadership programs. Whereas faculties are happy to deliver the theory part, we were told, the practice angle seems to be left to the field by default. Our informants told us that a good university program in leadership should attend to both theory and practice, as befits a professional faculty. These are some of the contextual features that informed our thinking about program design.

Search for Standards

The knowledge base in educational leadership has been the subject of a great deal of reflection, debate, and thought throughout the past decade. Four recent examples of the search for an acknowledged cognitive base for educational leadership emerge as guiding lights for our program restructuring. The four examples include the work of the University Council of Educational Administrators (UCEA), the Interstate School Leaders' Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), and the National Council for School Leaders (NCSL) in the United Kingdom.

The initial impetus for reconsidering educational leadership programs resulted from the benchmark report from the National Commission of Excellence in Educational Administration (NCEEA, 1987), *Leaders for America's Schools.* The UCEA took the initiative on the report's recommendations under the leadership of Patrick Forsythe in 1992 and developed a discussion around knowledge domains of educational leadership. Bredeson (1995) cites the UCEA as having identified seven knowledge domains reflecting the educational administration field, "...and that serve as organizers for mapping educational administration" (p. 52). After extensive research and consultation, and considerable controversy, the UCEA adopted these domains as the basis for the educational administration knowledge base. They are:

Societal and cultural influences on schooling;

Teaching and learning processes;

Organizational studies;

Leadership and management processes;

Policy and political studies;

Legal and ethical dimensions of schooling; and

Economic and financial dimensions of schooling.

In citing a rationale for developing these domains, the UCEA Plenum Report (1992) states that this was the first comprehensive effort to map and integrate the knowledge base "since the fragmentation and paradigm shifts of the 1970s and 1980s" (pp. 13-14). The report further signaled the end of the behavioral science era in educational administration studies–a period spanning the 1950s through 1980s where educational administration studies were characterized by a narrowly defined knowledge base (Greenfield, 1988, p.147), a neutral posture on moral issues (Culbertson, 1964, p. 311), and where educational practice was largely ignored (Murphy, 1992, p. 73). The report also claimed that the educational administration curriculum had been the product of "buffeting by social, historical, and political winds; it has never been the product of deliberate systematic, or consensual shaping by practitioners and scholars" (p. 15). These proposed domains were widely debated and, in some cases, were deemed inadequate (Barlosky, 2002). Whereas the UCEA knowledge base is likely an accurate depiction of the technical and scholarly aspects of educational administration, it also needs to be recognized primarily in the context of a functionalist framework within which it is embedded, with only marginal representation of the critical reconceptualist notions of school leadership.

Another significant development in the standards movement was initiated by the ISLLC under the auspices of the Council of Chief State Officers (CCSSO) and in partnership with the National Policy Board of Educational Administration (NPBEA). ISLLC developed the first universal standards for the licensing of school principals in 35 states in the United States (ISLLC, 1996). Murphy and Forsythe (1999) reported that this initiative "sets about strengthening the academic arm of the profession primarily through the manipulation of state controls over areas such as licensure, re-licensure, and program approval" (p. 28). The result was a model of leadership standards designed to enhance an understanding of effective leadership, to reflect the changing nature of society, and to nurture an evolving model of learning community. More importantly, the standards signaled a shift to linking the work of school leadership to

improving the learning conditions for the student. The six standards focus on the practical application of leadership in promoting the success of students by:

1. Facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community;
2. Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth;
3. Ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment;
4. Collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources;
5. Acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner; and
6. Understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

The ISLLC initiative has since expanded these standards to identify the knowledge, dispositions, and performances that are relevant to maintaining and sustaining these standards in school leadership settings (CCSSO, 1996).

Yet another standard-defining activity was undertaken by the NCATE (2000). NCATE's curriculum guidelines for school administration were developed in partnership with a variety of national level professional associations. Five general areas defining leadership are subdivided into 12 leadership standards and subsequently into many more distinct curriculum outcomes. NCATE's five general areas attempt to define the important components of leadership development programs as follows:

AREA I, STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP: The knowledge, skills and attributes to identify contexts, develop with others vision and purpose, utilize information, frame problems,

exercise leadership processes to achieve common goals, and act ethically for educational communities.

AREA II, INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP: The knowledge, skills, and attributes to design with others appropriate curricula and instructional programs, to develop learner-centered school cultures, to assess outcomes, to provide student personnel services, and to plan with faculty professional development activities aimed at improving instruction.

AREA III, ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP: The knowledge, skills, and attributes to understand and improve the organization, implement operational plans, manage financial resources, and apply decentralized management processes and procedures.

AREA IV, POLITICAL AND COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP: The knowledge, skills, and attributes to act in accordance with legal provisions and statutory requirements, to apply regulatory standards, to develop and apply appropriate policies, to be conscious of ethical implications of policy initiatives and political actions, to relate public policy initiatives to student welfare, to understand schools as political systems, to involve citizens and service agencies, and to develop effective staff communications and public relations programs.

AREA V, INTERNSHIP: The internship is defined as the process and product that result from the application in a workplace environment of the strategic, instructional, organizational, and contextual leadership program standards. When coupled with integrating experiences through related clinics or cohort seminars, the outcome should be a powerful synthesis of knowledge and skills useful to practicing school leaders.

Most recently, the standards work in educational leadership has taken another step forward in its efforts to further clarify the knowledge base. In 2002 the NCATE, UCEA, and ISLLC work came together under the umbrella of the National Commission for Advancement in

Educational Leadership Preparation (NCAELP). The NCAELP standards essentially mirror the NCATE standards described above (Andrews & Grogan, 2002).

In the United Kingdom the standards work has been adopted and defined by the National College of School Leadership (NCSL). These national standards attempt to classify the skills and attributes of leadership at beginning and advanced levels. The College has developed 10 propositions that inform the school leadership task (NCSL, 2002). The propositions attend to the nature, values, and development and support of school leadership, and, they define the "parameters for a framework for school leadership that is firmly grounded in learning as well as transformational" (p. 8). Most of the National College's 10 propositions bear a striking resemblance to recent standards work emanating from the United States. Nine of these state that school leadership must: be purposeful, inclusive and values driven; embrace the distinctive and inclusive context of the school; promote an active view of learning; be instructionally focused; be distributed across the school community; build capacity by developing the school as a learning community; be futures oriented and strategically driven; be developed through experiential and innovative methodologies; and be served by a support and policy context that is coherent, systemic, and implementation driven. The 10th proposition asserts that school leadership "must be supported by a National College that leads the discourse around leadership ..." (p.14).

In contrast to the standards movement in the U.S., and its strict regulations for licensing principals, and the recently established National College for School Leadership in Great Britain, there have been no parallel large-scale developments in Canada. Attempts at revising the educational leadership curriculum have been confined to the purview of the individual institutions. Provinces have similarly refrained from getting involved in setting standards, although some do have certification requirements (Hickcox, 2002). Only Ontario requires a master degree or equivalent as a basic qualification for a school principalship as well as

specialized certification courses for prospective principals. There are no certification requirements for the principalship in the province of Alberta, although many local jurisdictions will require a master degree for prospective school leaders. A recent cross-Canada survey indicates " that this formal, ad hoc, essentially scattered and uncoordinated approach to training for school administrators is the case in the majority of jurisdictions" (Hickcox, 2002). Hickcox argues that "systematic training and licensure requirements for school principals increase the chances of high level performance by principals" (p. 4).

Possibly the most defining work in Canada in developing leadership standards has been undertaken by Begley (1994, 1995) at the Ontario Institute of Studies in Education at the University of Toronto. Begley's work has developed into a leadership profile (adapted from Ken Leithwood's groundbreaking work in this area) that carefully describes five stages of development within each leadership component. The key components include establishing standards for the principal as manager, instructional leader/program facilitator, school-community facilitator, visionary, and problem solver. Other significant Canadian research has attempted to uncover the nature of organizational conditions and student engagement under different types of school leadership (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1998, 2000a, 2000b; Leithwood & Prestine, 2001; Leithwood, Edge, & Jantzi, 1999).

Alberta-Based Program Revisions

The Faculty of Education at the University of Calgary launched a study in 1998 in quest of updating its Master program in educational leadership under the guidance of Diane Yee (Yee, 2001). In revising the program content for the University of Calgary program, Yee refers to leaders of the past as "operating in closed information systems…where information, or lack thereof, determined a person's position in the educational hierarchy" (p. 2). She uses this and other observations as a backdrop for informing her position that contemporary educational

leadership requires lifelong learning. In determining a relevant knowledge base for the Calgary program, Yee suggested eight domains in a taxonomy of courses and she further determined that the following content is appropriate for a graduate program:

- Communication skills and human resource development;
- School culture and group process development;
- Professional ethics;
- Site-based management and community relationships;
- Leadership in learning and staff development;
- Information technology in education;
- Curriculum for the future and innovation in education; and
- Politics in education.

Subsequently the University of Calgary program was revised to reflect Yee's classifications, and courses have been developed and offered in each of the domains.

The University of Alberta , until recently, had not revised its educational leadership program since Miklos and Ratsoy completed their study of program problems in general (1992). A recent undertaking reviewing the content of its educational administration program and has resulted in forming a 10-course package of educational leadership programming, delivered to a cohort in a totally course-based program. The new University of Alberta program will begin in 2003.

The Knowledge Base

All of the standards and domain work and the subsequent program changes reflecting this in the 1990s have been an extension of the initiative to redefine the knowledge base in educational leadership. In relation to the new information age and subsequent disenchantment with the former behavioral science approach to educational administration studies, Donmoyer,

Imber, and Scheurich (1995) state, "The epistemological problem can be stated succinctly: Knowledge today is not what it used to be. Contemporary conceptions of knowledge in the social sciences...are radically different..." (p. 3). From a pragmatic perspective, many practitioners have described traditional administrative preparation programs as being out of touch with practical concerns. Claims are frequently made that the knowledge required in action-oriented contexts is fundamentally different from the theoretical knowledge valued in universities, but according to Murphy (1992) a sound leadership program does not make distinctions between theory and practice.

Bredeson (1995) supports the need to establish a common, clearly understood cognitive base for educational leadership programs. He states, "...a knowledge base, by definition, marks off the territory of a given field of study and practice" (p. 48). Griffiths (1988b) further expands on this definition by making a distinction between the use of a knowledge base in a professional school and in an arts and science model: "The professional school model should prepare students to act, not merely think about administration" (p. 14).

According to Caldwell (2000) a promising approach is for programs to be based on domains in which particular issues arise from time to time. "Such 'domains of innovation' include curriculum, pedagogy, school design, professionalism, leader development, resources, knowledge management, governance and boundary spanning" (p. 476).

The Dialectic Age

From a historical perspective Murphy (1992) traces the landscape of leadership preparation from its inaugural efforts in the 19th century to 1992. He categorizes educational leadership preparation into 4 distinct periods:

- Era of Ideology 1820-1900
- The Prescriptive Era 1900-1945

- The Behavioral Science Era 1946-1985
- Dialectic Era 1986-

Murphy (1992) believes that the dialectic era is characterized by reflection, responsiveness, deregulation and reconstruction. For example, the taxonomies cited above (UCEA, ISLLC, NCATE, NCSL-UK, Yee, 2001) each represent recent examples of soul-searching attempts to define the knowledge base to respond to educational reforms and societal change. The Dialectic Age has stimulated a reconsideration of the significant internal and external factors on schooling and subsequently on educational leadership. From a societal perspective in Canada, the impact of economic, social, and political developments in the 1990s has had a direct impact on how educators think about schooling and its challenges. Chief among these impacts are the widening gap between the rich and poor, an enhanced value on cultural diversity, the ascendancy of market-driven values, globalization, and a broadening of universal access to information. These developments, as well as institutional changes, an emerging form of community and site-based governance, and new understandings about learning and pedagogy, have all informed leadership program reviews and restructuring initiatives in leadership development worldwide.

Philosophical beliefs and understandings have also contributed to shifts in interpretations of the educational leadership knowledge base, particularly regarding evolving discourses about power, diversity, equity, and gender. For example, Foster (1999) believes that postmodernism makes three significant claims to dispel myths about knowledge and power:

1. Knowledge is nonfoundational…[and] is always produced in specific contexts, which are time and space (spatiotemporal) dependent.
2. …the agreement that we develop about the meaning of 'true' knowledge is intimately related to the distribution of power in a society.

3. The resulting outcome is the development of what poststructuralists call 'grand narratives' or widely accepted stories that construct reality for most of us and that serve to maintain the existing system of privileges and power. (p. 104)

Foster further suggests that administration has become a contested domain with respect to order, metaphysics, representation, and history. Postmodern, feminist, radical critical theorists question, among other things, assumptions about the roles and functions of leadership (seen as instrumentalist manipulation), the goals of education (in whose interests are these goals?), and the role of culture in shaping purposeful action (exploiting emotional lives to serve the interests of the organization) (Gunther, 2001). Whereas we think there is some merit to some of these arguments, we do note that while these various "out-of-the box" ways of looking at educational leadership have been scathing in their denunciation of functionalist/behaviouralist approaches hitherto dominant in traditional conceptions, they have posed little in the way of a concrete vision that could supplant them. As Mitchell (2003) notes in this regard:

> It is, in short, the illusions of the postmodernists, not their intent to humanize knowledge, that need to be held up to the light of experience. Postmodernism is not stupid in its passion for progressive realization of social justice, nor is it wrong in its insistence that knowledge is humanly created and authenticated through community validation. The postmodern error lies in their loss of any way to ground their knowledge assertions in experience and thus any way to advance their knowledge beyond the prides and prejudices of their politically situated authenticating communities (Teachers College Record, 2002).

Restructuring and Educational Leadership

The field of educational leadership has also had to respond to a system-wide movement that has become to be known as restructuring. Many of the changes in education in the 1990s were made in the name of restructuring—a broad term that encompasses structural, pedagogical, and community redefinition. Restructuring also refers to the political aspects of addressing cost issues in the mid 1990s that resulted in a move toward a site-based decision-making environment. As a concept, Senge (1990) ushered in the notion of restructuring by suggesting that we needed to promote and develop systems thinking if we were to introduce meaningful change. Barth (1990) implies that the restructuring movement is nothing if not built upon establishing norms of collegiality. These ideas, coupled with the influence of Sergiovanni's (1992) concept of leadership in a learning community, helped inform the restructuring movement throughout the 1990s that ultimately focussed on site-based decision-making, shared visioning, engaged learning processes, assessment practices, and developing learning community. From a leadership perspective, perhaps the central idea underpinning each of these developments is the need for continual learning and improvement coupled with a distributive theory of leadership (Elmore, 1999). This implies a shift from the idea that leadership emanates from a hierarchical, position-power authority to a shared, collaborative form of leadership (Andrews & Grogan, 2002).

In explaining the complexities of restructuring, Newmann (in Brandt, 1995) states that as few as 10% of schools that undertake improvement initiatives are successful. These are the ones that focussed on teaching that "changed and responded to restructuring as a growth process, pursuing change through a reflective dialogue—as opposed to mandated change—and schools that measured their success by improved learning through changed classroom practice" (p. 71). The school improvement movement in Alberta has clearly established teacher growth and leadership coupled with grass roots involvement as the linchpin to student achievement and

positive change (Alberta Learning, 1999). This creates a unique challenge for leaders who are striving to link the school improvement initiatives to school and system goals and to purposeful reflective practice.

In response to the restructuring movement, leadership preparation programs need to include some in-depth study of cognitive development and pedagogy, such that school and system leaders can facilitate professional growth and take part in the dialogue, and support innovative classroom practice from an informed perspective. Disaggregating data, supporting a results-oriented culture, and purposeful visioning are meaningful leadership skills needed to support the school improvement process. One of the ISLLC (1996) standards, for example, goes directly to the need for principals to promote success of students by developing a school culture conducive to staff learning and professional growth.

Akin to the restructuring initiatives has been the development of school improvement projects that speak to reculturing as the essence behind successful school improvement. Fullan (2002) thinks of reculturing as transforming the culture from a change perspective "...changing what people in the organization value and how they work together to accomplish it...leads to deep, lasting change" (p. 59). Fullan further states that only principals who are equipped to handle a complex, rapidly changing environment can implement the reforms that lead to sustained improvement in student achievement. School improvement initiatives have been central to restructuring in many jurisdictions throughout North America, but none has been as purposeful and focussed as the Alberta experience. Alberta adopted its school improvement initiative in 1999 and provided considerable financial support for schools and systems that were prepared to identify an improvement project, research the background, identify the resources, plan professional development that focussed on the improvement, and to measure the project's success. This on-going initiative responds best to a distributive form of leadership that facilitates and supports a dedicated and committed approach to sustained school improvement—because

the improvement initiative and subsequent change is not a mandated one—it is purely a voluntary approach by committed staff who view professional growth to be closely linked to results and improvement. The relationship between school improvement and leadership is strengthened and supported by a constructivist approach (Lambert, Walker, Zimmerman, Cooper, Lambert, Gardner, et al., 1995), where the leader's success in involving all the participants in a continual dialogue about school improvement is an integral component of successful change.

In summary, "there seems to be a growing consensus that the processes the educational leader uses must be transformational in nature if an expanded leadership team is to work …" (Grogan & Andrews, 2002, p. 6). Skilled leadership is absolutely essential for an effective system-wide focus on improvement, and leadership development programs need to acknowledge this key contextual variable.

Educational Leadership Models

The theories or constructs of leadership have emerged and been reconstructed in the 1990s to reflect the changing role, nature, and responsibilities of educational leadership. (Caldwell, 2000; Elmore, 2000; Foster, 1999; Lambert, et al., 1995; Lambert et al., 2000; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000; Murphy, 2001; Murphy & Forsyth, 1999). Most advocate a theory of constructivist leadership, building on a new conception of leadership that incorporates human learning, community, patterns of relationships, and diversity. Constructivist leadership goes beyond supporting a constructivist approach to learning in classrooms—it means facilitating the learning of colleagues who, in a community, together construct meaning and new knowledge. Lambert, et al. (1995), claim that this involves reciprocal processes, namely: building a trusting environment; breaking down old assumptions and myths that get in the way of looking at things differently; constructing meaning together; and finally taking action using new behaviors and

purposeful intention. Ideally all participants in a community may be expected to practice constructivist leadership. To do this a leader needs to understand respective grounded knowledge, values, and assumptions about teaching and learning. Such an understanding requires guided reflection, research, and intensive dialogue about the art and craft of teaching. University courses need to create an open dialogue so that colleagues can pose questions about the nature of schooling, learning, and teaching from diverse groundings and assumptions. Various constructs or models of leadership that have emerged in this period are referred to as distributive, transformational, instructional, moral, and contingent leadership (Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 1999).

Most of the recently developed taxonomies of leadership skills include a disposition toward professional learning to build instructional capacity (Spillane & Louis, 2002), a school improvement focus (Pounder, Reitzug, & Young, 2001), and collaborative decision-making (Rallis, Shibbles, & Swanson, 2001). In addition, particularly in the resource-rich province of Alberta, leadership is supported and enhanced by the use of technology—as a management device, as a means to develop relevant information to inform decision-making, and as a tool for learning in and out of the classroom (Etzkowitz, Webster, & Healey, 1998; Sandholtz, 2001; Sandholtz, Ringstaff, & Dwyer, 1997). Administrators' responsibilities must include supporting the efforts of their staff to adopt and adapt new technologies to achieve new levels of productivity and achievement. In effect, leaders must provide the vision of change that includes empowering teachers and learners in new ways and then learning how to effectively manage these empowered teachers and learners (Conley & Muncey, 1999; Schlecty, 2000; Warren Little, 2000). Some claim that the traditional schools we have typically built or inherited are no longer relevant (Brubaker, 1995; Yee, 1998). Technologically informed teachers, students, and parents, the use of the Internet, global learning opportunities, and constructivist strategies of learning all

behoove leadership preparation that responds to these needs and provides the vision and support for educational communities.

Professionalizing the Teacher and Educational Leadership

In 1997 Alberta's Minister of Education enacted a Ministerial Order that essentially elevated teaching to a professional status overnight. The establishment of Teaching Quality Standards provided a basis for teachers and the public to understand the roles, responsibilities, and standards for teaching practice. In addition the subsequent regulation ruled out the continuance of a cyclical evaluation process to monitor and control the teaching standard. Instead teachers are now expected to create a professional growth plan in consultation with the school principal, thereby enhancing the role of professional development in the growth and continuing education of the teacher. A further component in professionalizing the teaching ranks requires that the principal adopt a supervision practice that implies a detailed understanding and dialogue about the ongoing teaching practice in the classroom. This practice closely monitors the development of a new teacher, and implements procedures for response to concerns and complaints about teaching practice. As a result, school leaders now have an enhanced role in matters such as facilitating school improvement, staff development, teacher portfolios, mentorship of new teachers, and empowering teachers to made critical decisions. Many claim that teacher competency is on the rise (Schlecty, 2000). Enhanced evaluation of learning methods, changes in understanding about pedagogy, multidegreed teachers, and the globalization of knowledge have each contributed to the professionalization of the Alberta teacher. School leaders are no longer the sole brokers of power in Alberta schools, and as a result, leaders need to be highly skilled at sharing leadership responsibilities, at accommodating professional needs (and demands), and at being accountable for facilitating a professional learning community. The collegial nature of leadership work is acknowledged and summed up by NCAELP as follows:

> In high performing schools and districts, educators experience enormous degrees of autonomy within a professional collegial community that allows teachers to team for learning of all students. The intensity of instruction and the active engagement of all students in learning increase when five conditions are present in schools: (1) teachers perceive their principals as instructional leaders; (2) the educators in schools hold high and uniform expectations for all students; (3) educators in schools frequently monitor student progress and adjust instruction based upon student performance; (4) educators in schools hold a shared vision and common goals for the school; and (5) a nurturing learning climate is present in the school and supported by a collegial community with high levels of professional autonomy. (Grogan & Andrews, 2002, p. 6)

The Governance Model—and Educational Leadership

When the Alberta government restructured education in 1995, decentralization was the key theme. Most of the government supporting documents and policies advocated a locally developed form of site-based decision-making as a way to include participants in the process and to improve education. Studies in the middle to late 1990s suggested that SBDM was embraced by many school leaders as an effective way to make important decisions about learning in their schools (David, 1995; Guskey & Peterson, 1995; Schlecty, 1992; Short and Greer, 1997). Others cited the SBDM process as a challenge that struggled under the shroud of cost cutting and "downloading" (Aitken & Townsend, 1998). Regardless of these perceptions, the evolving model of SBDM to a shared decision making process means that school leaders are required to be skilled at collaborative and inclusive strategies. The underpinnings of learning community call for a responsive and informed disposition to a shared decision-making model. Working with school councils, responding to parent concerns, dialoguing with teachers, collaboratively solving problems, and collaborating with senior administration—all demand skilled leadership. The

ISLLC, NCATE, and the UEAC standards each reflect the importance of this component by including it in standards and domains of the knowledge base. Successful leaders share their power with participants skillfully, purposefully, and willingly such that the educational community not only has many voices, but also a significant stake in the success of the school.

Values, Morals, and Ethics in Educational Leadership

Much of the emerging concept of school leadership is grounded in the fundamental practice of recognizing values and actively engaging in moral stewardship. Campbell, (in Begley, 1999) states:

> Contemporary, theoretical, and empirical literature increasingly has addressed the necessity for educators to regard their professional responsibilities as basic moral and ethical imperatives. Moral agency, moral purpose, and the moral authority of accountable practice in education are highlighted (Fullan 1993; Grace 1995; Hodgkinson 1991, 1995; Sergiovanni, 1992, 1996). Closely related to this is the growing emphasis on building moral communities in schools (Sergiovanni, 1996) and the demand that schools stand for and reflect valued principles (Cohen 1995; Wynne & Ryan, 1993).

The subsequent debate regarding "Whose values?" or "What virtues? and the interpretation of guiding principles have all added a complex dilemma for school leaders (Hodgkinson, 1999; Willower, 1998). In a learning community where shared purpose is valued, the leader has to balance this with the value of individual thought and growth. How does the leader weigh, for example, a set of traditional, perhaps outmoded, values of some parents with the Alberta Learning mandate to create functional, contributing learners in society? There are significant philosophical challenges for the school leader to acknowledge—not the least of which are matters of choice, and relativistic perspective. Again

leadership preparation programs can and ought to provide a forum for an in-depth dialogue about these values, dilemmas and dichotomies. According to Murphy (2002) social justice is a powerful construct underlying the leadership profession, and moral stewardship is a metaphor of a role in which the leader has a moral imperative to address the learning needs of the school.

Programming for Educational Leadership

Collaborative learning initiatives

Many North American universities made changes to educational administration programs throughout the 1990s. The majority of the changes were made to respond to the need to attract students in a competitive market. Some of the changes were made to reflect new interpretations of the knowledge base in educational administration. In Alberta, the University of Lethbridge introduced its current program in 1992. The University of Calgary introduced significant changes to its master's program in 1998, and the University of Alberta (U of A) began in 2002 to revise its Educational Administration and Leadership Master's specialization and will implement change in 2003. In summary, changes have been made to delivery systems, to instructional and research strategies, in course content, to degree requirements, and to standards of performance. The University of Lethbridge, in September 2002, hosted 49 master's students who had indicated an educational leadership specialization in their program registration. Many of these students were frustrated and experienced difficulty in finding ways to complete their programs. Small enrolment, variable entry points, scant course offerings, limited staff resources, and content that may have served us well in the 1990s have contributed to the need to rethink the content and organization of the program.

At a faculty meeting called to discuss the master's program on April 29, 2002, the administration outlined a plan to move toward organizing the program around cohort focus groups. It was agreed that such an approach would better utilize faculty resources, provide a

more concentrated focus for the students, allow for better long-term planning, and provide an opportunity to review the content of the master's program. The literature cites several instances of the cohort approach as an effective way of learning, particularly for practicing administrators (Hart & Pounder, 1999; Milstein, 1993). Murphy (1997) specifically challenged his educational administration survey respondents to cite significant recent developments to the structure of leadership programs.

> A [significant] change has been the widespread implementation of cohort programs in universities—a model that, according to the respondents in this study, has moved to center stage in the play known as educational administration reform. …the cohort model has helped create programs that are more integrated, focussed, and sequential than those that dotted the landscape in 1987. (p. 61)

From the student perspective, the opportunity to learn in cooperative settings, to collaboratively solve problems, and to dialogue about leadership dilemmas in a safe environment are a few advantages that are evident in the cohort approach.

Another emerging change in leadership preparation programs has been in curricular organization. In past years these programs were organized around functions, disciplinary knowledge bases, and roles associated with school administration. Current emphases suggest that leadership candidates need to apply their understandings of these concepts to real problems of practice (Bridges & Hallinger, 1997). Problem-based learning has its roots in the medical profession and others. Our proposal includes organizing the program around three recurring themes—leader as educator, moral steward, and as community builder. To integrate these themes throughout the program there needs to be a shared planning process and a commitment to a consistent pedagogical approach to teaching. Pounder, Reitzug, and Young (2002) address the challenges of cooperative planning and collaborative teaching:

> Modular course experiences, problem-solving learning, case method, or administrative simulation teaching approaches could enhance the integration and synthesis of administrative knowledge and skills. These techniques and others should be explored in order to reduce the 'silo' structure of many administrative preparation programs and promote a more web-like structure. (p. 282)

A further curricula consideration is the sequencing of courses and learning experiences. Given that course offerings will be dependent on available faculty at any given time, consideration also needs to be given to sequencing skill development such that participants have the requisite background and experience to scaffold their learning. For example, core experiences in research methods (inquiry) and building professional community provide the base for curriculum, foundations, visioning, and collaboration courses. The group problem-solving experience and the internship will provide culminating experiences and opportunities for candidates to synthesize their learning and apply their understandings to real applications.

Assessing the current program

Following extensive study and analysis, Murphy (1992) concluded that in general educational leadership programs across the continent were suffering and struggling. The following concerns about leadership programs in general were cited by Murphy (1992, pp. 79-108). These concerns can serve as cues to reflect on the quality of a leadership program. (See Appendix D).

1. Questionable recruitment and selection practices
2. Weak knowledge base
3. Fragmented programs
4. Lack of connection to practice

5. Lack of attention to education and ethics. Bates (1984, p. 261) claims there is a deafening silence concerning the fundamental message systems of schools: curriculum, pedagogy, and evaluation.
6. Arts and Science model versus the Professional School and Faculty
7. Structural issues
8. Degree structure
9. Faculty
10. Instructional approaches
11. Standards.

Measuring up to the Standard (Characteristics)

Murphy (1992) believes that curriculum in reconstructed preparation programs should be characterized by authenticity, complexity, and interrelatedness. He cites the following principles to be particularly appropriate for redesign work in educational leadership programs:

- Developing capacity to learn: 'The program should be designed to help students develop the capacity to learn (as opposed to accumulating information).'
- Multi-source content: The program should feature multi-source, interrelated content (as opposed to a single-source, multidisciplinary approach).
- Generative topics: The curriculum should be constructed 'out of generative topics' (Perkins, 1991, p. 6), 'essential questions' (Wasley, 1991, p. 42), or around authentic problems of practice (as opposed to being based on roles or academic disciplines).
- Depth of experiences: The emphasis should be on depth of experiences (as opposed to content coverage).

- Original source documents: The program should use original source documents (as opposed to textbooks).
- Single core curriculum: The program should feature a single core curriculum (as opposed to specialized programs).
- Professor choice: Professor choice is a key to developing good curricular experiences (as opposed to prescribed learning sequences). (p. 147)

In this discussion we have addressed three dominant themes that have permeated the reinvention of leadership preparation programs. The first theme has been the on-going efforts to revise and strengthen the knowledge base. These efforts have been frequently accompanied by innovations in teaching and program delivery. The second theme sees the emergence of practical experiences into leadership preparation programs—or, in particular, the attempts to merge professional development and preparation. The third theme has been the development of licensure, certification, and accreditation standards.

Changing to meet a standard

University of Lethbridge's core and concentration courses need to reflect a new knowledge base for developing leaders that stresses self-understanding, using inquiry, shaping school communities, and understanding and interpreting people and contextual influences. To respond to the need to create a substantive program that incorporates current ideas about cognition, the program needs to challenge participants to think as leaders about the issues, and to link thoughts to actions. Our standard calls for a combined domain specific, cognitive skill orientation—based on current interpretations about research, organization, learning community, problem-solving (integrating the theory, research, clinical history, and best practice), and experiential learning. Leithwood and Steinbach (1995b) suggest that both cognition and domain-

based learning are important and that a successful leadership development program will reflect an appropriate balance between the two.

Connecting students to the realities and nuances of practice is another important feature of our proposed program. Caldwell (2000) states:

> Almost all innovative programs…are connecting participants to practice in a variety of ways, including the use of mentors and coaches who are experienced school principals, attachment to exemplary schools for a period of time, and school-based projects for assessment of progress or achievement. (p. 480)

The importance of narrowing the theory-practice gap is also addressed by Hallinger (1992), who found, in analyzing the opinions of education leadership graduates about their programs, that the "culture of the local school, prior experience, and the role expectations of others in the local school community were identified as key factors that moderated the transfer of training" (p. 312). The University of Lethbridge School Leadership program must provide more frequent and significant opportunities for authentic skill practice with expert feedback when skills are a focus of preparation. Graduate participants in the Hallinger studies also observed that field-centered or sensitive exercises, which brought them into contact with schools, were considered to be among the most valuable learning activities. "This type of high-risk, high-return activity requires support and assistance in order to obtain the full impact on the individual and the organization" (p. 312).

Coaching support and district cooperation are needed to ensure successful implementation of newly learned skills. For this to happen, school districts will be asked to accept responsibility for supporting the integration of leadership development into school and district practice. Superintendents will be expected to support the learning of their school leaders by adapting district personnel policies and promoting meaningful field experiences. New ways of

thinking and new skills do not survive without demonstrated support through district norms, policies and practices (Hallinger, 1992; Hallinger & Anast, 1992).

To be consistent with the sequential development of the leader, the exiting requirement needs to reflect the candidate's growth and development in representing knowledge discovery, problem solving capability, and the use of sound acceptable forms of inquiry. Either an internship-based project or a research-oriented thesis will meet this standard.

Applying the Standard: Purpose and Structure of the Master's Specialization in Educational Leadership

The purpose of the M.Ed. specialization in Educational Leadership at the University of Lethbridge is to provide the knowledge and skills, and to identify and enhance key dispositions, for candidates who wish to develop a leadership focus to their teaching career. We propose that a cohort structure be used to provide the students with a controlled curriculum, to enable the University to guarantee a complete program, and to afford the students with unique learning opportunities that aim to narrow the gap between theory and practice. To develop and support school leadership, the emphasis will be on a critical examination of the value and ethical basis of leadership models and a thorough review of a widen range of theories, constructs, and contexts—reflecting a cognitive perspective to skill development, complemented by problem solving, experiential, and inquiry opportunities.

The proposed program in Educational Leadership at The University of Lethbridge reflects Murphy's (2002) three central themes that require leaders and stakeholders to think about the profession in terms of students and their learning—leaders as moral stewards, educators, and community builders. We think the program is visionary, rigorous, and relevant—with the aim of providing unique scaffolding to the profession in practice. The underlying goal and orientation is to produce competent, compassionate, and pedagogically focused school leaders whose work is committed to the success of every child. As a professional

school that understands how its mission differs from that of the Arts and Science model, the Faculty of Education needs to be able to attest to the competence and quality of its educational leadership graduates in a field that has experienced dramatic changes in the past decade.

The following guidelines will determine the structure, content, and standards for the M.Ed. Educational Leadership Specialization:

- The courses have been designed to meet the needs of school leaders based on current developments in the field of education and new interpretations of leadership knowledge bases.
- All students in the program will take a common set of courses in both the core and concentration areas, with some variation in the culminating stage.
- The culminating exercise will be one of: (a) a thesis; or (b), an alternative authentic representation of the leadership development experience—including an in-depth internship and a leadership portfolio.
- Faculty will need to share the teaching responsibilities in the program. The program will need a focused articulation of content and coordination of activities consistent with the special demands of cohort-organized courses in a professional faculty. Adjunct staff may need to teach in the program, especially in concentration offerings.
- The program will reflect standards that have emerged from the work of the National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation (NCAELP) (North America), the National College for School Leadership (UK), and the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at The University of Toronto.
- The program will be enhanced through a rich partnership between faculty and leaders in school systems. The latter will be asked to endorse candidates, to

support an internship program, and to share significant data. Faculty will be committed to collaborating with the field in each of these matters.

The program will follow the 12-course format currently required in the General Master's Program, Faculty of Education, with an important exception: Thesis students will be required to follow a 13-course program. Courses are of three kinds: core, concentration, and elective. Perspectives and topics for core and concentration courses will reflect the knowledge, skills, and dispositions explicitly or implicitly flowing from the leadership standards that inform the design of this new program. (See Appendix B for more on course content.)

The Leadership Series of core courses will be designed for the particular needs of leadership students in terms of perspective and topics. First, there is the issue of perspective. For example, while ED 5500 has traditionally been designed from the perspective of individual educators who wish to develop a wider framework to view their own professional development, ED 5500 in the Leadership Series will focus on a school wide and staff perspective in the context of school improvement. Secondly, topics will be added or emphasized in the Leadership Series of core courses. By way of illustration, ED 5400, Educational Research, is an introduction to quantitative and qualitative paradigms and methods, with the aim of providing students with the knowledge and skills necessary to read and understand research literature. In the Leadership Series, a key topic that should be added is understanding and interpreting school data, especially regarding student achievement. The latter is a critical skill for school-based leaders in Alberta and a basic expectation of the standards that inform the design of this program. This capacity will be further refined in ED 5631. ED 5200, Curriculum Studies and Classroom Practice, is typically an introduction and exposition of the meaning of curriculum. The Leadership Series, while still acknowledging curriculum theory and development, will also address implementation issues such as planning and evaluation.

The following core courses will be taken by the entire cohort and offered in a *series* format to include topics germane to a leadership perspective:

- Education 5200—Educational Leadership Series: Curriculum Studies and Classroom Practice.
- Education 5300—Educational Leadership Series: Foundations of Modern Educational Theory and Practice
- Education 5400—Educational Leadership Series: Nature of Educational Research
- Education 5500—Educational Leadership Series: Understanding Professional Practice and Professional Development

The following five courses will be considered as concentration courses and will be taken by the entire cohort:

- Education 5630: Educational Leadership and the Change Process.
- Education 5631: School Culture and the Instructional Program
- Education 5632: Managing the Organization
- Education 5633: Governance, Collaboration, and Community Engagement.
- Education 5634: Collaborative Problem Solving

Non-thesis students will take one graduate elective course from the General Master's Program, to be approved by the leadership coordinators.

The following paths will be available for a culminating experience:

Path A Thesis: four-course equivalent, or

Path B: Education 5635: Leader Internship (A 120-hour program spent in direct, on-site service)—one course equivalence; and Education 5636-Advanced Seminar in Education

Leadership. Includes developing and sharing the leadership portfolio product—one course equivalence.

Summary and Conclusion

School administration has recently emerged from its corporate or management roots, and from under the umbrella of the behavioral sciences into a new era of development. Traditionally our ways of thinking have evolved around (1) the processes of administration, (2) the roles, tasks, and functions of administration, and (3) the theoretical models and constructs that underscore the profession. The University of Lethbridge General Master's degree program, although steeped in andragogically sound principles, has not responded well to changing context and systemic developments in the school leadership field. This paper has cited significant shifts in the contextual factors influencing schooling, as well as important changes in teaching and learning, and new forms of decision-making and governance. All of these factors have resulted in a need to ground the preparation of school leaders in relevant and purposeful content, pedagogy, and curricula experiences. We have further argued that leadership preparation programs need to underscore the development of knowledge, skills, and dispositions toward school improvement, democratic and collaborative community, and social justice. Hence our proposed program will focus on school leadership from three key perspectives—principals as educators, moral stewards, and community builders.

The most profound challenge we as a faculty have is to move away from the disciplinary, role-oriented, and administrative function silos to a more holistic, focused, and integrated preparation of school leaders.

References

Aitken, A., & Townsend, D. (1998). Lessons to be learned from the Alberta experience: Principals' reactions to restructuring. *The Canadian Administrator, 37*(6), 1-5.

Alberta Learning. (1999). Alberta Initiative for School Improvement. Edmonton, AB: Author. Retrieved from: http://www.learning.gov.ab.ca/k_12/special/aisi/q_and_a.pdf

Andrews, R., & Grogan, M. (2002). *Defining preparation and professional development for the future.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation, Racine, WI.

Barlosky, M. (2002). *In search of leadership standards: Quest or quagmire? – Some philosophical and pragmatic reflections.* Unpublished manuscript.

Barman, J., Maguire, T., & Thomas, G. (1992). *External review of the Master of Education program at the University of Lethbridge*. A report to the Faculty of Education, University of Lethbridge, May, 1992.

Barth, R. S. (1990). *Improving schools from within.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barth, R. S. (2002). The culture builder. *Educational Leadership, 59*(8), 6-11.

Bates, R. J. (1984). Toward a critical practice of educational administration. In T. J. & J. E. Corbally (Eds.), *Leadership and organizational culture: New perspectives on administrative theory and practice* (pp. 260-274). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Begley, P. T. (1994). *School leadership in Canada: A profile for the 90's.* Hillsdale, ON: Paul Begley and Associates.

Begley, P. T. (1995). Using profiles of school leadership as supports to cognitive apprenticeship. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 31*(2), 176-202.

Brandt, R. (1995). On restructuring schools: A conversation with Fred Newmann. *Educational Leadership, 53*(3), 70-73.

Bredeson, P. V. (1995). Building a professional knowledge base in educational administration: Opportunities and obstacles. In R. Donmoyer, M. Imber, & J. J. Scheurich, (Eds.), *The knowledge base in educational administration: Multiple perspectives* (p. 52). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Bridges, E. M., & Hallinger, P. (1997). Using problem-based learning to prepare educational leaders. *Peabody Journal of Education, 72*(2), 131-146.

Brubaker, D. L. (1995, November). How the principalship has changed: Lessons from principals' life stories. *NASSP Bulletin*, 88-95.

Caldwell, B. J. (2000). Scenarios for leadership and abandonment in the transformation of schools. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 11*(4), 475-499.

Campbell, E. (1999). Ethical school leadership: Problems of an elusive role. In P. T. Begley (Ed.), *Values and educational leadership*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Cohen, P. (1995). The content of their character: Educators find new ways to tackle values and morality. *Curriculum Update, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development*, 1-8.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1996). *Interstate School Leaders licensure Consortium: Standards for school leaders*, (p. 16). Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved June, 2002, from www.ccsso.org/pdfs/isllcstd.pdf

Culbertson, J. A. (1964). The preparation of administrators. In D. E. Griffiths (Ed.), *Behavioral science in educational administration, Sixty-third NSSE yearbook, Part II* (pp. 303-330). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

David, J. L. (1995). Who, what, and why of site-based management. *Educational Leadership, 53*(4), 4-9.

Donmoyer, R., Imber, M., & Scheurich, J. J. (Eds.). (1995). *The knowledge base in educational administration: Multiple perspectives.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Etzkowitz, H., Webster, A., & Healey, P. (Eds.). (1998). *Capitalizing knowledge: New intersections of industry and academia*. SUNY Series, Frontiers in Education. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Elmore, R. F. (1999-2000). Building a New Structure for School Leadership. *American Educator,* 6-13.

Foster, W. (1999). Administration science, the postmodern, and community. In Begley, P. T. (Ed.), *Values and educational leadership* (pp. 97-114). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform*. London: Falmer Press.

Fullan, M. (1995). The change leader. *Educational Leadership, 59*(8), 16-21.

Fullan, M. (2002). *The Jossey-Bass reader on educational leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fullan, M., & Hargreaves, A. (1996). *What's worth fighting for in your school?* New York: Teachers College Press.

Grace, G. (1995). *School leadership: Beyond education management*. London: Falmer Press.

Greenfield, T. B. (1988). The decline and fall of science in educational administration. In D. E. Griffith, R. T. Stout, & P. B. Forsythe (Eds.), *Leaders for America's schools* (pp. 207-232). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Greenfield, W. D. (1995). Toward a theory of school administration: The centrality of leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 31*(1), 61-85.

Griffiths, D. E. (1988). *Educational administration: Reform PDQ or RIP*. (Occasional paper, no. 8312) Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration.

Gunter, H. (2001). Critical approaches to leadership in education. *Journal of Educational Enquiry, 2*(2), 94-108.

Guskey, T. G., & Peterson, K. D. (1995). The road to classroom change. *Educational Leadership, 53*(4), 10-14.

Hallinger, P. (1992). School leadership development: An introduction. *Education and Urban Society, 24*(3), 300-316.

Hallinger, P., & Anast, L. (1992). The Indiana principal leadership academy: Assessing school reform for principals. *Education and Urban Society, 24*(3), 410-430.

Hart. A. W., & Pounder, D. G. (1999). Reinventing preparation programs: A decade of activity. In J. Murphy & P. B. Forsythe (Eds.), *Educational administration: A decade of reform* (pp. 115-151). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Hickcox, E. (2002). *Shaping the principalship in Manitoba*. Commissioned by the Manitoba Council for Leadership in Education. MB, Canada.

Hodgkinson, C. (1991). *Educational leadership: The moral art.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Hodgkinson, C. (1995). Towards an axiology of leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration and Foundations, 10*(2), 72-83.

Hodgkinson, C. (1999). The will to power. In P. Begley, (Ed.), *Values and educational leadership* (pp. 139-150). Albany: NY: State University of New York Press.

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. (2000). Standards for school leaders. In M. Fullan (Ed.), *The Jossey-Bass reader on educational leadership* (pp. 97-113). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lambert, L., Walker, D., Zimmerman, D., Cooper, J., Lambert, M. D., Gardner, M., & Slack, P. J. (1995). *The constructivist leader*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Leithwood, K. (2000). School leadership in the context of accountability policies. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 4*(3), 217-236.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (1998, April). *Distributed leadership and student engagement in schools.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2000a). The effects of transformational leadership on organizational conditions and student engagement with school. *Journal of Educational Administration, 38*(2), 112-126.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2000b). Principal and teacher leadership effects: A replication. *School Leadership & Management, 20*(4), 415-434.

Leithwood, K., & Prestine, N. (2001). Unpacking the challenges of leadership at the school and district level. In J. Murphy (Ed), *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century* (pp. 42-64). Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Leithwood, K., Edge, K., & Jantzi, D. (1999). *Educational accountability: The state of the art.* Gutersloh, Germany: Betelsmann Foundation Publishers.

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1999). Changing leadership for changing times. *Changing Education Series*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

Miklos, E., & Ratsoy, E. (1992). *Educational leadership: Challenge and change*. Edmonton, AB: Department of Educational Administration.

Milstein, M. (1993). *Changing the way we prepare educational leaders: The Dan forth experience*. Newbury Park, PA: University Council for Educational Administration.

Mitchell, D. E. (2003). A review of the book [Education reform: Bright people sometimes say stupid things about education]. Teachers College Record. Retrieved May 2, 2003, from http://www.tcrecord.org .

Muncey, D. E., & Conley, S. (1999). Teacher compensation and teacher teaming: Sketching the terrain. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education; 12*(4), 363-85.

Murphy, J. (1992). *The landscape of leadership preparation: Reframing the education of school administrators.* Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J. (2002). *Reculturing the profession of educational leadership: New blueprints*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation, Racine, WI.

Newmann, F. M., Smith, B., Allensworth, E., & Bryk, A. S. (2002). Improving Chicago's schools: School instructional program coherence. *ERS Spectrum, 20*(2), 38-46.

Pounder, D., Reitzug, U., & Young, M. (2001). Preparing school leaders for school improvement, social justice, and community. In J. Murphy, (Ed.). *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century* (pp. 261-288). Chicago, IL: The National Society for The Study of Education

Rallis, S., Shibles, M. R., & Swanson, A. (2001). Repositioning lay leadership: Policymaking and democratic deliberation. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century* (pp. 239-260). Chicago, IL: The National Society For The Study Of Education

Sandholtz, J. H. (2001). Learning to teach with technology: A comparison of teacher development programs. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education; 9*(3), 349-74.

Sandholtz, J. H., Ringstaff, C., & Dwyer, D. C. (1997). *Teaching with technology: Creating student-centered classrooms*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Schlecty, P. C. (1992). *Schools for the 21st century*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schlecty, P. C. (2000). Leading a school system through change. In M. Fullan (Ed.), *Jossey-Bass reader on educational leadership* (pp. 182-201). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of learning organization.* New York: Doubleday.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). *Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1996). *Leadership for the schoolhouse: How is it different? Why is it important?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Short, P. M., & Greer, J. T. (1997*). Leadership in empowered schools: Themes from innovative efforts*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Townsend, D. (1996). Looking at the work of principals. *Challenge, 33*(1), 4-9.

UCEA Agenda for the 1992 Plenum. (1992). The University Council for Educational Administration. Proceedings of the UCEA, USA, Agenda.

Warren Little, J. (2000). Assessing the prospects of teacher leadership. In M. Fullan (Ed.), *Jossey-Bass reader on educational leadership* (pp. 390-418). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Willower, D. (1998). Fighting the fog: A criticism of postmodernism. *Journal of School Leadership, 8*(5), 448-463.

Wynne, E., & Ryan, K. (1993). *Reclaiming our schools: A handbook on teaching character, academics and discipline*. New York: Macmillan.

Yee, D. (1998, January 8). *Developing educational leaders for the 21st century*. Retrieved from http://www.ucalgary.ca/~dlyee/edlecontext.html

APPENDIX A

Provincial Leadership Initiatives

A. University Programs.

Universities of Lethbridge, Calgary, and Alberta each run summer leadership programs in which eligible participants can register for credit. In the University of Lethbridge program students engage in a number of topics including a history of educational leadership in schools, professional growth, and learning community. The Calgary leadership program provides opportunities for all stakeholders in education to participate in meaningful cross-role dialogue about education. The centre models processes and activities that can be utilized in a wide variety of educational settings. Participants in the Centre's programs include representatives of teachers, support staff, principals, superintendents, trustees, Alberta Learning personnel, parents, students in public schools, teacher education students, graduate students, and professors.

B. Online Programs

In addition to its Executive Development offerings, the Organizational Leadership and Learning Division currently at Royal Roads offers two graduate degree programs: a Master of Arts in Leadership and Training and a Master of Arts in Distributed Learning. Available from http://www.royalroads.ca/lsr/calendar/current/oll.htm

NAESP's leadership academy. The Leadership Academy offers some of the U.S.'s best practitioners and experts who discuss the skills and issues we face now and will in the future. The NAESP also offers programs and events ranging from single-day workshops to conferences. Available from
http://www.naespacademy.org/courses/leadership.html
http://www.naesp.org/pdev.html

The NASSP also offers secondary school principals an opportunity to improve leadership skills by using an Individual Assessment Exercise and Development Guide.
Available from
http://www.principals.org/training/04-03.html

Teachers' College at Columbia University. Lifelong Learning is at the core of CEO&I–experiences which enrich both personally and professionally. At CEO&I, education is viewed as an ongoing, lifelong process of learning and development, and our courses provide opportunities for students from a diverse range of backgrounds to come together in a unique environment that encourages creativity, innovation and scholarship. Available from
http://www.tc.columbia.edu/ceoi/courses.html

The following distance education website offers links to short courses, summer programs, and online courses around the world:
http://www.ecis.org/profdev/distance/short_and_degree.htm

C. Interest Groups

The Education Leadership Academy offered by the **Alberta Teacher Association** is an in-residence professional development program for school administrators and others interested in assuming leadership positions. The program, which has run successfully for 12 years, takes place at Westridge Park Lodge in Devon in August each year. In addition to being an excellent

opportunity to network with other administrators, the program can be credited toward a university degree.

The International Educational Leadership Programs (IELP) operate within the Department of Administration, Rehabilitation & Post Secondary Education, College of Education, San Diego State University. In the late 1970s the Educational Leadership Program, began a summer degree program for international students leading to a Master of Arts degree in Education with a concentration in Administration and Leadership. The students completed their course work for the degree in 3-4 summers. This program has evolved into a multiple option/multiple emphasis program that includes distance education. More than 1800 international students have graduated from the program. Prominent Alberta Educational Leaders—Jim Gibbons, Paul Dolynny, Leroy Sloan, Ed Wittchen, Greg Woronuk, and Roger Mestinsek—were all involved with offering the program that served 60–80 Albertans in any given summer. http://ielp.homestead.com/ielphome.html (This program terminated in 2002.)

Beginning in 2003 Royal Roads University in Victoria will offer a combined distance education-seminar Master's of Arts in Educational Leadership in Alberta. Some of the leaders previously involved with San Diego State (Jim Gibbons and Leroy Sloan) are marketing the program.

The Center for Leadership and Learning (CLL)—(see "university programs" above)—operates in conjunction with the University of Calgary and offers institutes every summer to around 30 students. A quarter-course credit in the Graduate Division of Educational Research may be earned through full participation with additional course work and assignments. There is also a section of the course available for on-line participants.

The **College of Alberta School Superintendents** (CASS) offers two non-credit leadership programs each year. The short course in Banff is usually hosted in October and the summer institute in Olds houses up to 30 participants in July each year.

The Faculty of Education at The **University of Lethbridge** offers a Summer Leadership Institute on leadership from provincial, national, and international perspectives. It offers professional development courses, practical leadership skills, and a variety of inquiry opportunities. Course credit is available for those participants who meet the faculty's research requirements.

D. Local Initiatives

Most large school districts in the province design and offer a one-of version of leadership programs. Some specialize in working with aspiring and new principals, and others cater to the development needs of experienced leaders. To date none of these locally developed programs is offered for credit purposes.

APPENDIX B

Proposed Course Content

University of Lethbridge

Master of Education—Leadership Specialization

ED 5200 —Educational Leadership Series: Curriculum Studies and Classroom Practice (Teaching and Learning Processes)

Curriculum Theorizing and Categories: Prescriptive, Descriptive, Critical-Exploratory
Curriculum Development and Change
Curriculum Planning and Implementation
Accountability, Evaluation Models, and Student Assessment
Influencing Factors, Politics, and Curriculum Decision Making

ED 5300 —Educational Leadership Series: Foundations of (Modern) Educational Theory and Practice (Organizational Studies and Critical Theory

Purposes of Education
Philosophy and History of Leadership in Education
Post Modernity and Critical Theory and their Impact on Educational Leadership
Gender Equity and Leadership

ED 5400—Educational Leadership Series: Nature of Educational Research (Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches)

Interpreting Student Achievement Data
Understanding Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methodologies
Reading and Understanding Research

ED 5500—Educational Leadership Series: Understanding Professional Practice and Professional Development

Understanding the Professional Practice of School Leaders
Understanding Professional Development in the Knowledge Creation School
Means of Understanding School Improvement as it Relates to Professional Development
The Facilitation of Professional Development in a Learning Community
Preparing a Professional Development Portfolio

ED Leadership 5630 Educational Leadership and the Change Process

Understanding the Change Process
Leadership Models, Administrative Theory and Meta-narratives
Vision and the Leadership
The Knowledge Base of Educational Leadership
Understanding Restructuring
Interpreting Standards Based Accountability

ED Leadership 5631 School Culture and the Instructional Program

Nature of Instructional Leadership – Curriculum/Instruction/Supervision and the Learning Environment
Best Practices for Student Learning
Measurement, Evaluation and Assessment Strategies
Developing Learning Community and School Culture
Adult Learning Theory and Professional Growth Plans

ED Leadership 5632 Managing the Organization

Nature of Organizational Leadership:
–Human Resources
–Physical Resources
–Budgeting
Linking Outcomes and Operations Management
Developing Learning Community through Strategic, Long Range, and Operational Planning
Security and Safety Issues and Practices
Technological Support for Management Operations.
Political and Legal Context and its Impact on School Leadership

ED Leadership 5633 Governance, Collaboration, and Community Engagement

Community Relationships
Site Based Decision Making Models
Shared Decision Making
School Councils
Ethics, Values, and Moral Leadership
Consensus-Building and Negotiation Skills

ED Leadership 5634 Collaborative Problem Solving

Identifying, Clarifying, Interpreting, and Analyzing a Problem.
Collectively Developing and Implementing Problem-Solving Strategy.
Reporting the Findings.

ED Leadership 5635 A Leadership Internship
Journal, Leadership Portfolio, and Self-Improvement
On-Site Leadership Responsibilities
Meetings with Coach and Faculty Consultant
Preparation of Showcase Portfolio

ED Leadership 5636 Advanced Leadership Seminar
Issues, Trends, and Challenges in Educational Leadership
Leadership Portfolio Presentations

ED Leadership Cohort Course Schedule	
Summer 2003	ED 5400
	ED 5500
Fall /Spring 2003/04	ED 5630
	ED 5631
Summer 2004	ED 5200
	ED 5300
Fall 2004	ED 5632
	ED 5634
Spring 2005	ED 5633
	ED 5635 (Internship or Thesis)
Summer 2005	ED 5636 Project (Thesis) Defense, Professional portfolio presentations
	ED Elective

Culminating Options

The following paths will be available for a culminating experience:

Path A:

Thesis: four-course equivalent.

OR

Path B:

ED 5635: Leader Internship (A120-hour program spent in direct, on-site service)—1-course equivalence.

ED 5636: Advanced Seminar in Education Leadership. Includes developing and sharing the leadership portfolio product—1 course equivalence.

APPENDIX C

Internet Resources for Educational Leadership Development Programs

A. Leadership Profiles and Checklists

School Leadership: A Profile Document is by Svede and Jeudy-Hugo from the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (1997). This Web site is based on Begley's (1994) publication, *School Leadership in Canada: A Profile for the 90's*. The site includes much of the original text and a list of references and Internet resources.
Available from http://www.oise.utoronto.ca/~vsvede/

The North Central Regional Education Laboratory contains the following links to critical leadership information and topics:
New Leaders for Tomorrow's Schools (full-text versions of back issues). Available from http://www.ncrel.org/cscd/pubs/newlead.htm

Leadership Audit Tool: A Participatory Management Checklist, School and Family Involvement Surveys, Schools administrators and parents will find links to three parent involvement surveys at this Web site that will help them examine how their school communicates with parents and the degree to which the families at their school believe the school environment is welcoming. In addition to the survey links, the web site provides information and resources to help plan and assess their school's parent involvement efforts. Available from
http://www.ncrel.org/cscd/proflead.htm

Urban Learners Leadership Institutes. On this Web site you will find a summary of initiatives to utilize stakeholder leadership teams to bridge student achievement gaps. Available from
http://www.ncrel.org/cscd/ulli/

NCREL's Pathways to School Improvement server has several Leadership Critical Issues; Building a Collective Vision, Building a Committed Team, Establishing Collaboratives and Partnerships, Creating High-Achieving Learning Environments and Leading and Managing Change and Improvement. Available from
http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/le0cont.htm

The Home site is accessed at http://www.ncrel.org/cscd/

B. Principals' and Teachers' Organizations and their Leadership Resources

1. Coalition of Essential Schools. This site is home for the Ted Sizer initiative to acknowledge the principles for developing successful schools.
Available from
http://www.essentialschools.org/
2. OUTREACH provides a secure, web-based platform for school districts, offering administrators, teachers, students and parents permission based access to a virtual school district. The task of building or managing a school or district Internet is now possible without any programming. Powerful templates allow for rapid, easy development and maintenance of your digital school district. Users and groups are managed through a secure web interface. Access

privileges for users and groups are set through an easy-to-use control panel, allowing secure access to confidential information based on permissions. Web Masters can customize each school site to reflect its own image. Available from
http://www.schoolnet.com/

3. The Canadian Association of School Administrators. This site provides a platform for CAP and a new service for its members called the School Leaders Listserv which provides regular "clippings" of research, reports, media articles, and Internet information for administrators and their school staffs. Available from
http://www.schoolfile.com/cap.htm

4. The Education Leaders in Middle and High Schools Web site is from the National Association of Secondary School Principals. Available from
http:/www.principals.org

5. The Principal Online website is from the National Association of Elementary School Principals. It contains valuable links to other research sites as well as perspectives on current topics of interest. Available from
http://www.naesp.org/

6. The American Association of School Administrators website includes articles on "Front Burner Issues," conferences, programs and American legislative alerts.
Available from
http://www.aasa.org/

7. The Saskatchewan School-Based Administrators' Professional Development Program is a modular program that was developed in response to a 1991 initiative from the Saskatchewan School-Based Administrators special subject council.
Available from
http://www.stf.sk.ca/

8. The Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation website outlines many professional growth opportunities in the area of leadership.
Available from
http://www.stf.sk.ca/

C. University Educational Leadership Initiatives

1. TCRecord is a Teachers' College of Columbia University online publication featuring articles on leadership and curriculum issues.
Available from
http://www.tcrecord.org/

2. Leadership 2000-II is a doctoral studies cohort program in Educational Leadership from the University of Central Florida.
Available from
http://pegasus.cc.ucf.edu/~educlead/

3. UCEA The University Council for Educational Administration is a consortium of 67 major research universities in the United States and Canada. The dual mission of UCEA is to improve the preparation of educational leaders and promote the development of professional knowledge in school improvement and administration.
Available from
http://tiger.coe.missouri.edu/~ucea/
The UCEA website also links out to the following related websites:

- American Association of School Administrators (AASA)
- American Educational Research Association (AERA)
- AERA Division A

- AERA Division L
- Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO)
- Franklin Pierce Law Center (FPLC)
- National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP)
- National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP)
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (CATE)
- National Council of Professors in Educational Administration (NCPEA)
- National Education Association (NEA)
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA)
- National School Boards Association (NSBA)

4. The National Commission for Excellence in Educational Leadership
5. The National College for School Leadership

D. Provincial/State Level Leadership Resources and Research

1. The Leadership Critical Issue research website, from Pathways to School Improvement is created by the North Central Regional Education Laboratory. It includes the following topics:

- Building a Collective Vision
- Building a Committed Team
- Establishing Collaboratives and Partnerships
- Creating High Achieving Learning Environments
- Overview: Leading and Managing Change and Improvement

Each topic includes an overview, goals, options, pitfalls, illustrative cases, contacts and references.
Available from http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/le0cont.htm
2. The Educational Issues and Information web sites from the Saskatchewan, Alberta, and B.C. School Trustees' Association include a variety of leadership-related topics.
Available from http://www.ssta.sk.ca/ and http://www.asba.ab.ca/index.asp and http://www.bcsta.org/
3. The U. S. Department of Education Research and Improvement Reports and Studies website includes a variety of leadership and school reform topics.
Available from http://www.ed.gov/pubs/studies.html
4. The Role of Leadership in Sustaining School Reform: Voices From the Field (July, 1996) is a report from the U. S. Department of Education. "What 'habits of mind and heart' enable some school leaders to guide successful school change over time? Here's what dozens of successful education leaders across the country said in response to that and other questions on The Role of Leadership in Sustaining School Reform."
Available from http://www.ed.gov/pubs/Leadership/
5. The Links to Staff Development and School Improvement Resources website from the National Staff Development Council website includes the 10 U.S. regional educational laboratories.
Available from http://www.nsdc.org/
6. **ATA** Follow the links to rich professional development resources and specialist councils representing key curricula and leadership disciplines. Available from http://www.teachers.ab.ca/
7. CASS Available from http://www.cass.ab.ca/
8. ASCD's Educational Leadership. Available from http://www.ascd.org/readingroom/edlead/elintro.html
9. Learning Theories and Models of Teaching. Available from

http://www.cloudnet.com/~edrbsass/edlea.htm
10. A springboard to numerous associations, councils, and other U.S. national educational organizations. Available from http://www.lib.uchicago.edu/e/su/edu/orgs.html
11. Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium: Standards for School Leaders. Available from http://www.ccsso.org/pdfs/isllcstd.pdf
12. The International Electronic Journal for Leadership in Learning. Available from http://www.acs.ucalgary.ca/~iejll/

APPENDIX D

Assessing the Faculty's Master's Program

Following extensive study and analysis, Murphy (1992) concluded that in general educational leadership programs across the continent were suffering and struggling. Using Murphy's (1992) critique of educational leadership programs in general as a prompt, use the questions in the right hand column to reflect on the quality of our program.

	Murphy's Concerns	Questions
1	Questionable recruitment and selection practices	Are we admitting committed individuals who are growth-oriented, inquisitive, and academically attuned?
2	Weak knowledge base	Are our courses connected to a recognized and accepted knowledge base, or are we using a hit and miss approach to some of our courses and investigative efforts?
3	Fragmented programs.	Would an examination of our courses collectively reveal common or consistent purpose and reflect systematic design?
4	Lack of connection to practice	Does the content of our educational leadership program bear resemblance to superintendent and principal responsibilities?
5	Lack of attention to education and ethics	Are the fundamental systems of schools' curriculum, pedagogy, and evaluation appropriately emphasized?
6	Arts and Science model	Are we clear on the components of a professional school model?
7	Structural issues	Can a small system sustain its program such that students are guaranteed certain givens in their program?
8	Degree structure	What does the Masters of Teaching degree prepare one for?
9	Faculty	Do we have appropriate faculty available to support teaching requirements and supervision demands at any given time?
10	Instructional approaches	Are we using traditional approaches only to teaching in a field that purports to emphasize instructional leadership?
11	Standards	Is the faculty grading system robust enough to acknowledge differences in academic standing, quality of performance, and contributions to learning and growth?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX E

Summary Notes – Graduate Level Educational Leadership Programs

Gonzaga University

1. "Leadership Formation" Program
This unique program delivers its leadership curriculum embedded in specially designed case studies to an intake of 16 to 18 students per year. Of the students admitted, two spots are reserved for superintendents and two others for various district-level positions. Course work in the form of role-plays–even with paid actors or consultative experts at times–provides participants with situational learning, while requiring the appropriate background and preparation (ie., current research, legislation, theory). The program has a delivery period of two to three years, culminates with a one-course credit research project and comprehensive oral exam, and may include a one-year internship, depending on the student's desire for certification.

2. Master of Arts in Administration and Supervision
Tauted as Gonzaga's *international* program, the MAAS is the more traditional of the two programs. Cohort groups of 20 or more students participate in an off-campus delivery model, attending summer session courses on campus. The program delivers two courses per term, with four of those courses being required. A fifth required course, "Research and Statistics" is completed near the end of the program and coupled with the final research project (one course equivalent). The student selects five further courses from a list of at least nine electives. This program is not certification-driven and is based on the action research model, enabling participants to initiate effective growth and change within their schools and/or professional practice.

Masters of Education in Administration: "Pathway to Administrative Leadership"

Offered completely on line, the P.A.L. Program follows a prescribed schedule of 12 required courses, including an option for an action research project or thesis. Each course/project/thesis is assigned the same three-credit weighting within the program. Defining characteristics of this program include its alignment with Oregon licensure standards and the consequent 360+ hour internship.

University of Alberta
Master of Education: Educational Administration and Leadership.
A proposed program will offer a 10-course package for master's students.
Until 2002, Educational Administration and Leadership was a specialization offered within the M.Ed. program. These graduate studies included two required courses common to all M.Ed. programs and two required courses within the Ed. Administration and Leadership specialization. Further graduate level electives were chosen at the discretion of each student and his or her academic advisor.

University of Calgary
Master of Education with Specialization in Educational Leadership
One full course equivalent in research methods and two full course equivalents in Educational Leadership provide the foundational knowledge in this program. Three other electives round out the program and are followed by a culminating project. This program can be delivered on line.

University of Saskatchewan
Master of Education in Educational Administration
Very similar in structure to Gonzaga's MAAS program, the U of S M.Ed. includes four required courses, five electives chosen from a select set of courses, and two open electives (total of 33 credits). The 21-credit thesis route is usually reserved for full time students. The time limit for completing the program is five years from the date of registration.

San Diego State University
Master of Arts in Educational Leadership
The Master of Arts degree in Education with a concentration in Educational Leadership with a specialization in preK-12 is intended for students pursuing administrative posts in preK-12 educational organizations, including school business managers. (Ended in 2002)

University of Washington
Master of Education & Danforth Educational Leadership Program Combination
The Danforth Educational Leadership Program is worthy of note due to its carefully developed pedagogy and comprehensive design. Danforth Program applicants must enroll simultaneously in the M.Ed. program and be prepared to have half-time release from their regular position in order to meet the internship requirement. The prescribed Danforth Program accounts for the majority of the graduate program and is built on the following components:

- Cohort structure
- Internship program with mentor principals
- Summer institute
- Integrated curriculum
- Weekly reflective seminars
- Formative program evaluation

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
(OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

Reproduction Release

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: DESIGNING A MASTER PROGRAM IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP: TRENDS, REFLECTIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS	
Author(s): AITKEN, A., BEDARD, G., & DARROCK, A.	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign in the indicated space following.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
Level 1	**Level 2A**	**Level 2B**
☑	☐	☐
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only
Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.		

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche, or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: [signature]	Printed Name/Position/Title: ARTHUR J. AITKEN, VISITING PROFESSOR	
Organization/Address: FACULTY OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF LETHBRIDGE, 4401 UNIVERSITY DRIVE LETHBRIDGE, ALBERTA, T1K 3M4 CANADA	Telephone: 403 329 2433	Fax: 403 329 2252
	E-mail Address: art.aitken@uleth.ca	Date: 03/02/28

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706
Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)